

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed October 4, 2006, claims 1, 5 and 7-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davis. The foregoing rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of the claims have been amended herein. New claim 18 has been added. Support for claim 18 can be found at FIG. 3, for example.

Claims 1, 5 and 7-18 are currently pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites "an oven having a main body forming an oven compartment, and a door in contact with the main body to open and close the main body, the door comprising: an inner cover facing the oven compartment and having an opening to show the interior of the oven compartment; a window provided in the opening of the inner cover; a supporting member which supports the window against the inner cover; and the inner cover comprising a window accommodating part which extends towards the inside of the oven compartment from a periphery of the opening to accommodate the window, the window accommodating part comprising L-shaped portions including grooves therein, wherein the window is fittingly inserted into the grooves and contacting with the periphery of the opening of the inner cover and the window accommodating part, **wherein the supporting member comprises: a plate part combined with the inner cover and having an opening part corresponding to the window; and a supporter integrally combined with the plate part and extended from a periphery of the opening part of the plate part toward the inside of the oven compartment which supports the window against the window accommodating part of the inner cover**". Claim 13 recites features somewhat similar to claim 1.

In contrast, Davis discusses an oven door assembly having an inner liner 18, a window opening 44 defined by a channel 46 and various ledges which define a multilevel appearance of the inner liner 18. Davis further includes a window assembly 20 having a window frame 54 which mounts apposing windows 56 and 58 (see FIGS. 11 and 12, for example). The frame is u-shaped and includes opposed side walls 60 and 62 connected via a web 64. The spring flanges 66 and 68 extend outwardly from terminal ends of the sidewalls 60 and 62, respectively (see column 3, lines 1-14, for example).

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the web 64 is comparable to the Applicants "plate part" as recited in claim 1, for example. The Examiner also asserts that the side wall 60 and the spring flange 68 of Davis are comparable to the Applicants "supporter" as

also recited in claim 1 and functions to support the window against the inner liner 18. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Davis fails to discuss “the supporting member comprises: **a plate part combined with the inner cover and having an opening part corresponding to the window; and a supporter integrally combined with the plate part and extended from a periphery of the opening part of the plate part toward the inside of the oven compartment which supports the window against the window accommodating part of the inner cover,**” as recited in claim 1, for example. That is, the web 64 of Davis is not combined with the inner liner 18 (see FIG. 12, for example). Further, the web 64 does not have an opening part corresponding to the window 56 or 58. Thus, since the web 64 does not include an opening, neither the side wall 60 nor the flange 68 extend from a periphery of an opening part of the web 64. Thus, the present invention as recited in claim 1, for example, patentably distinguishes over Davis.

Claim 13 recites “...**attaching a supporting member to the inner cover**, the supporting member contacting with the window and securing the window to the inner cover; adhering the window to the window accommodating part with a supporter of the supporting member being in contact with a periphery of the window”. That is, in the present invention, the supporting member is attached to the inner cover. For at least the reasons mentioned above, claim 13 also patentably distinguishes over Davis.

Dependent claims 5, 7-12 and 14-17 recite patentably distinguishing features of their own. For example, claim 15 recites “the supporting member further comprises a plurality of bosses which project from the outer surface of the supporting member and through which screws pass toward the inner cover”.

Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/26/2006

By: 

Deidre M. Davis

Registration No: 52,797

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501